

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 463 249

SP 040 539

AUTHOR Konecki, Loretta; Pottorff, Don; King, Caryn; Lin, Emily; Armstrong, Dorothy; Pryor, Sherrill; Reinken, Barbara; Collins, Sherry; Melin, Jacque; Shroyer, Janet; Eikenberry, Glenda

TITLE Teacher Education for Career Changers.

PUB DATE 2002-02-05

NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Teacher Educators (Grand Rapids, MI, February 5, 2002).

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Adult Learning; *Alternative Teacher Certification; Career Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Internship Programs; Partnerships in Education; *Preservice Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This paper describes a graduate teacher certification program for people with baccalaureate degrees and teachable majors and minors, examining program development, design, recruitment, and admissions processes and discussing the teacher education needs of these post-baccalaureate career changers. The program is responsive to adult learners who are committed to becoming teachers. Interns are totally immersed in the culture of schools; they are placed in a school and begin their experience on the first day of the cooperating school and remaining there through the university's academic year. They are prepared to integrate technology into the classroom and to become leaders in technology integration. The paper reports how faculty, interns, and graduates believe that the program prepares adults for new careers as school teachers. It concludes that adults want to learn how to be successful teachers, recognize the need to learn about students, schools, and teaching, and want to invest time and money in well-organized programs that take advantage of their limited time to learn a new career. They prefer to control their experiences but are willing to be flexible. They hold high standards for themselves and their instructors and mentors, and they want the program to be high quality. (Contains 21 references and a list of additional readings.) (SM)

TEACHER EDUCATION FOR CAREER CHANGERS

Authors: Loretta Konecki, Don Pottorff, Caryn King, Emily Lin, Dorothy Armstrong, Sherrill Pryor, Barbara Reinken, Sherry Collins, Jacque Melin, Janet Shroyer, and Glenda Eikenberry

paper presented at the ATE 2002 Annual Meeting: The Best Teachers for ALL Our Children, "To Teach or Not to Teach: Choices of Non-traditional Students"

February 5, 2002

**School of Education,
Grand Valley State University
Grand Rapids, Michigan**

by

Emily Lin, Ph.D., Cynthia Mader, Ph.D., and Ellen Schiller, Ph.D.

**School of Education,
Grand Valley State University
Grand Rapids, Michigan**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Lin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2

TEACHER EDUCATION FOR CAREER CHANGERS

Abstract

A graduate teacher certification program for persons with baccalaureate degrees and teachable majors and minors is described along with its development, design, recruitment, and admissions processes. The teacher education needs of these post-baccalaureate career changers is described. Faculty, interns, and graduates report their perceptions of the program and how it prepares adults for new careers as elementary or secondary school teachers. A summary of what has been learned follows.

TEACHER EDUCATION FOR CAREER CHANGERS

Nearly a decade ago a group of graduate faculty sat down to consider the possibility that our university might initiate a teacher preparation program for college graduates who had teachable majors. We read and continue to read articles and books about teacher education and reform (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Cruickshank, 1987; Danielson, 1996; Darling-Hammond, Griffin, & Wise, 1992; Dewey, 1933, 1938; Dilworth, 1992; Gideonse, 1992; Goodlad, 1990; Holmes Group, 1990; Houston, W. R., Haberman, M. & Sikula, J. (Eds.), 1990; Howsam, Corrigan, & Denmark, 1985; Lasley, 1986; National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education, 1985; Posner, 1993; Senge, 1990; Shulman, 1992; Sparks-Langer & Colton, 1991; Valli, 1992; Zeichner & Liston, 1996). We continually add to our reading list on topics related to reflection, decision-making, action research, collaboration, adult learning, multicultural and alternative teacher education. We brought in university catalogs, attended conferences, reviewed MAT and fifth year models, considered the standards for new teachers developed by the Grand Rapids schools and the Michigan Department of Education, and visited programs at other institutions. Finally, in 1996 after much discussion, planning and reflection, our design phase was complete and we initiated a graduate teacher certification (GTC) program.

Designing the Graduate Teacher Certification Program

When designing the GTC program, we did not want to compete with our undergraduate program. We wanted to create a unique program. Questions we considered included: For whom are we designing the program? Should it be a cohort or course-by-course program? How can we assure our candidates have appropriate subject

matter knowledge? To what extent can we combine and compact requirements? What is an appropriate sequence of courses? To what extent can we expect field placements to demonstrate in practice those theories discussed in university classrooms? Should we have one or multiple field placements? What type of faculty should be involved in the program? As we deliberated the answers to these questions, our philosophy about the GTC program began to emerge.

We decided that we wanted our program to be responsive to adult learners who are focused on and committed to achieving the goal of becoming a teacher. In order to achieve this, we developed a philosophy that can be simply described as theory into action. We wanted to have interns be able to learn and apply their learning in a "just in time" manner. Thus, we have taken the 39 semester hours of course work required in our undergraduate professional preparation program and compacted it into 24 semester hours. In addition, we decided to use a cohort model, with all interns taking courses together and being assigned in small groups to partnership schools for one academic year. It should be noted, however, that elementary interns actually take 36 credits, which includes 12 credits of the distributed minor taken the summer before and spring after the practicum.

We felt it was important for our interns to be totally immersed in the culture of schools. Thus, interns are placed in a school and begin their experience on the first day of the cooperating school. They will stay in that school through the university's academic year. The philosophy behind this is that in-depth understanding of one school provides the basis for understanding all schools. When setting up a partnership school, we try to establish a 3-5 year relationship with the school and ask that they take 3-6 GTC interns each year. We feel that establishing a longer and on-going relationship with a school,

and having a number of interns in a building, helps the school to better understand the program and helps the interns to have a support system with whom they can learn and share.

We also wanted to be sure that our interns would be computer literate. Many of them had a great deal of prior experience with technology but not its educational applications. They can choose to take a course or create a portfolio to demonstrate their skills. Both require sample lesson plans for integrating productivity software into the curriculum, evaluations of five different types of educational queries, and lesson plans utilizing Internet discussions of legal and ethical issues related to the use of technology. The goal is that they are prepared to integrate technology into their classrooms and to eventually become leaders in the integration of technology in their schools.

Originally, we tried to have a majority of the classes with a K-12 flavor. The rationale was that pupils go through school and need to have a seamless transition from one level to the next. If we are to promote this, we need to assure that teachers have a sense of education and how it is developed across grade levels. However, as we have expanded the program, we have had to separate class sections into elementary and secondary levels. This has mixed responses. Most faculty and interns like it as examples are more directly related to the interns' teaching levels. The program designers are concerned that there is a lack of understanding of the educational continuum and what we can learn from each other across the grade levels. At this time, the practical needs of the interns seem to be met best by having split sections by grade levels. We do, however, keep the K-12 orientation in the practicum seminars. Here the reflections of the interns

placed across the grade levels point out the similarity of concerns even though the specifics of how they are addressed may vary.

Recruitment into the Program

As the popular press provided more information on the need for teachers, our School of Education began receiving over 1000 calls per year from college graduates requesting information on how to become a teacher. To accommodate the public's search for more information, we began holding information sessions every other week on both our undergraduate and graduate teacher certification programs. People from all walks of life attend to find out what it takes to be a teacher. Many think that a teacher education program may include a few courses taken in the summer or at night and that their undergraduate major and minor make little or no difference. Thus, when they hear the Michigan teacher certification requirements for professional preparation and teachable majors and minors, they are shocked.

What happens to these individuals after the information session varies. About 200 of them begin the process of taking appropriate courses either through our graduate or undergraduate programs. However, most decide that it is more difficult to become a teacher than they thought and drop the idea. This is particularly true of persons with degrees in criminal justice, business, public administration, sociology, communications, and other areas that we do not have state approval for offering as teachable majors and minors. Persons with low grade point averages (GPA) in their prior undergraduate work are discouraged, since we require a minimum grade point average of 2.8 for admission to our undergraduate teacher preparation program, and a 3.0 for admission to our GTC program. Once they find out the expectations made for prospective teachers, some

possible teacher candidates wait until later to decide if they want to consider changing careers. Only a small number are ready to apply to the GTC program.

Admission to the Graduate Teacher Certification Program

There are numerous requirements for admission to the GTC program. The baccalaureate degree must have been earned at least 3 years prior to admission. A teachable major with a GPA of 3.0 or better must be complete. The teachable minor must be identified and partially complete with a GPA of 3.0 or better. The candidate must have passed the Michigan Teacher Tests for Certification in the basic skills areas of reading, writing, and mathematics and the test in the area of the major. Candidates are encouraged to take the test in the minor before admission to the program, but it is not required. However, both coursework and the test in the minor must be complete before the candidate can be recommended to the state for certification. In addition, applicants must meet the requirements for graduate admission to the university, provide evidence of computer competency as it applies to an educational setting through coursework or portfolio evidence, have completed at least 25 hours of work with children at the age level at which they wish to teach, pass the pre-teacher perceiver interview, file information on their police record, provide TB test results and a resume. Despite the fact that the application procedure is arduous, and we have never advertised this program, it has increased from 10 students in the 1996 cohort to 30 in 1999 and 60 in the 2000 cohort. We plan to maintain the current quality and number of GTC interns.

GTC Interns

Graduate teacher certification interns come to the program from a variety of prior roles--lawyers, engineers, dentists, nurses, social workers, taxi drivers, researchers,

physicists, chemists, homemakers, environmentalists, bankers, stock brokers, artists, musicians, ministers, television engineers, military personnel, sales, and office workers. Most indicate that they felt they wanted to "make a difference" or were "called" to be teachers. This commitment makes a difference.

From the beginning, they see themselves as teachers and are looking ahead to a time when they will have their own classrooms. Maturity, commitment, life experience, and academic achievement serve the interns well. One of their outstanding characteristics is their ability to apply their prior experiences to the classroom as a way to make what is being taught more relevant to their students. Whereas traditional teachers have spent most of their lives within the educational world, the interns can more easily bring real life experiences to the classroom by integrating their former professions into the classroom curriculum. These characteristics are found to be of particular interest to principals in our partnership schools.

One intern brought his scientific world into the elementary school by developing a science laboratory. With the help of the students, he developed a terrarium where plants could thrive. The laboratory housed an incubator where the children monitored daily the hatching and growth of baby chicks. They kept notes of the lighting and the temperature of the incubator. Chick hatching was an exciting event for the whole school.

Another elementary intern started a unit in social studies on foreign countries and cultures by using her previous occupation as a stewardess. She turned the classroom into an airplane and acted as the stewardess for the passengers who were the students. The students had to pack the necessary clothes that they would need for their country, and they were allowed only two bags on the plane. They had to show their identification card

and go through a security check. With the intern dressed in uniform and using the proper terminology, the whole experience was very realistic. The students were very motivated to learn about their country and to share the knowledge with each other. Activities such as the science laboratory and the airplane simulation facilitate learning because this knowledge goes into students' long-term memory where they can later retrieve it.

It is not always easy for interns to take advantage of their prior experiences in teaching. In our first year we had four interns in an urban high school, each had a different experience. The physics teacher, who had been involved in developing the state science standards, quickly saw ways to integrate the prior experiences of the former engineer intern in his classroom. Soon they were team teaching and taking advantage of the intern's practical experience and the master teacher's expertise in pedagogy. While down the hall, another science intern consistently criticized the teacher as her way to point out her expertise. She also was shocked that she needed to do preparation outside the school day. Her ways of working and her desire to control the situation caused problems and required numerous conferences between the university supervisor and the school to permit her to continue in the placement. On the other side of the building, an intern who was a lawyer was not permitted to even sit in on the civics class because he might notice something the master teacher did "wrong". After he got his first teaching position he was able to do the integration he had wanted to do. Another intern who was a former stockbroker was given the responsibility for a ninth grade social studies class when he walked in the door. Since his professional education was limited to a course in child development before entering the classroom, he was not prepared to take over classes from the first day in the school.

Over the years, we have learned more about the needs of our adult students. We now remember to remind them that they are guests in the partnership schools and as such they need to be conscious of the expectations for dress, for being open and not controlling or criticizing, and for being expected to do things outside school time. We also have learned to help schools work with GTC interns. Teachers now realize that most interns come to them with little or no understanding of what it takes to be a teacher but are fast learners. To facilitate intern learning, many schools have interns begin the year by observing in numerous classrooms at different grade levels. The master teachers now integrate interns into team teaching and/or small group settings over time and don't expect that just because they are adults, the interns already know how to teach.

Transformation of Interns into Teachers

Even though most interns look ahead and already view themselves as teachers who can use real world experiences in their classrooms, when they come into the program they are not teachers. They bring with them their memories of being a student, their experiences as parents, their impressions from the media, their dreams and their commitment. Most have excellent academic knowledge of content fields but they need help in becoming a practitioner.

Interns themselves acknowledge their need for teacher education. One intern stated it this way. "When I graduated with an undergraduate degree, I was well prepared to enter the work force. Years later when I decided to become a teacher I knew I would need training....My experiences in the classroom as a teacher are far different than what I remember my experiences being as a student...." Observations of university supervisors and faculty members point this out even more specifically.

For instance, one faculty member observed that GTC interns who enroll in the fall semester course, Developmental Reading – Secondary, bring a significant number of strengths to the program seldom found in undergraduate students. Most are mature, intense, idealistic, focused, eager to learn, and eager to apply the new things they learn. However, they also come with a set of needs that without pedagogical instruction would negatively impact their teaching.

Nearly all interns arrive wondering why they would be required to enroll in a literacy methods course and are at first skeptical about its value in their program. They frequently have a narrow perception of teaching and are somewhat naïve about its complexity. On the one hand, they have a real passion for working with students, while on the other hand, they typically possess only skills conducive to dispensing content knowledge through lecture. Sally, for example, wrote in her journal, “I think that the best way to teach high school students is through lecture and taking notes. That is the way that I learn best.” She was surprised to discover that she was in the minority among her classmates in that respect, and was unaware of the research on motivation theory, or interactive and participatory learning.

Student interns are at first skeptical about the need to teach learning strategies to their students. Most arrive viewing the classroom text as the curriculum and feel that if a student cannot read the text, he/she should either be excluded from the course, or should fail. Jack’s thinking illustrated this point when he wrote in his journal,

I have a significant concern about designing lessons to accommodate students at the lowest end of the scale. It seems to me that any attempt to dumb-down the lesson would be a major hindrance to those at the top of the (grading) scale. I

don't know if this is an appropriate attitude, but I am very concerned about providing all students with a challenge and instilling a desire for life-long, self-directed learning.

It is obvious that Jack has a strong desire for his students to learn, but is confused about his role as a teacher. He is uncertain about whether he should adapt his instruction to meet student needs, or whether students must conform to his narrow vision of textbook instruction. At the same time, he is focusing on students with lesser reading abilities, but is blind to the needs of gifted students who might be in his courses. He also needs to resolve the issue of teaching versus grading.

Another student, Benny, wrote with regard to the three levels of reading ability, i.e., independent, instructional and frustration, "I don't understand the big deal about reading at the frustration level. Frustration is a natural part of learning." At this point Benny does not realize that students who are consistently required to work at a frustration level frequently become discouraged, lose their motivation and tend to give up.

A second faculty member observed that elementary interns grapple with the technical language that is used in literacy instruction and discussions. When course materials are introduced, the technicality of the language and processes of various aspects of reading are overwhelming. But the interns are hungry for pedagogical knowledge because they see students struggling in the classroom and for some, their own children are struggling at home. They want to understand the technical language. They are fascinated by recent theoretical developments that have occurred in the last decade and how these theories become a reality in the classroom. The interns are quick to point out that in their former occupations, they dealt with adults and dealing with children is much

different. Learning how to observe and communicate with a variety of young people is exciting yet frustrating. But through experience and class discussion, the interns develop an understanding that there is no one way to teach children to read or to even communicate with them. They quickly learn that theory is the basis for how instruction occurs.

Similarly, interns enter the mathematics course with a belief that teaching elementary mathematics is equivalent to having children memorize the facts and algorithms of arithmetic as most of them did as children. When confronted with the broader goals of the reform curriculums and recommendations of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (2000), they are both surprised and a bit overwhelmed to find they have so much to learn to be effective teachers of mathematics in the elementary grades. The three most significant obstacles for them are their own histories of learning in a very different environment than what is expected today, their limited knowledge of mathematics, and their lack of familiarity with the pedagogical implications for teaching mathematics. Only a small number of elementary interns have strong mathematical backgrounds and many of their experiences in learning mathematics, particularly for older adults, were based primarily on rote drill and practice.

Our dedicated interns find themselves confronted with curriculum that is unfamiliar, and most disconcerting is their realization that they are not immediately or even easily able to “master” how to teach content such as mathematics or language arts. They anticipate being given rules on what to do when, but are confronted with a reality that is much different. Instead, GTC interns must develop their expertise while constructing their personal art of teaching.

It takes time and experience for our interns to appreciate how much they have to learn to be able to move towards the proficiency they seek. As the mathematics professor found, what interns learn in the literacy class through their analytical writing greatly enhanced the quality of their work and analytical writing about teaching mathematics. By thoughtfully linking assignments, both faculty and interns are excited about the progress they make. Being in the schools on a daily basis is also an advantage. Interns explore a variety of instructional methodologies, and they hunger for a variety of teaching approaches that meet the needs of diverse students because they are discovering in their practicum that one method does not work for all. GTC interns want to make a difference in the lives of their students, and by working with students and teachers, they better understand the challenges and successes of classroom life. This experience creates an opportunity for them to naturally engage in important GTC program outcomes of developing as reflective, inquiring, ethical, collaborative, decision-making practitioners.

As the time progresses, dramatic changes in attitudes and behaviors occur. Interns begin to see connections between content knowledge and pedagogical methods. When in the university classroom, they become avid note takers, ask for detailed explanations and want copies of materials. The interns push the faculty to tell them “everything” they know. Discussions are fascinating because the varied perspectives and voices in the conversation bring a plethora of ideas and issues to the forefront. Enthusiastic statements such as, “This is exactly what I need to teach my lesson” and “This is valuable!” are heard.

Despite all of the successes, not every GTC intern is able to make the transition to becoming a teacher. A very few interns have serious problems in working in classrooms

as teachers. Although every effort is made to help these interns, sometimes we must advise individuals that teaching is not the career for them. This is not easy for the school, university, or intern--especially since interns have put things on hold for a year to become a teacher. When this happens, we counsel them out of teaching, as we do not want to place ineffective teachers in classrooms. We are pleased that nearly all GTC interns are successful both in classes and in their teaching.

Perceptions of Interns and GTC Graduates

Each year faculty ask current and past interns to give us feedback about the program as we continue to refine and improve the program's design and components. In the fall of 2000, a new faculty member in the GTC program asked secondary GTC interns for their input while other faculty members asked graduates about their perceptions of the program. A summary of the findings of a content analysis of their responses paints a picture of their viewpoints.

Cohort Experience. When asked to identify the advantages of being placed in cohort groupings, many of the interns and graduates commented that being placed together with their peers provided them with both emotional and collegial support. They explained that the cohort experience offered the advantage of sharing common experiences and the opportunity to build meaningful relationships. In addition, the cohort model fostered collaborative sharing of ideas among interns. The respondents added:

It's helpful to hear other's experiences. It is reassuring to know other people have the same fears, concerns, etc. We also hear ideas from each other. Things that work or don't. I think it's also good as a support group.

(Respondent # 10)

Relationships are built more easily in cohort groups. These relationships can provide encouragement, differing perspectives on teaching and learning, "expert" advice from a variety of backgrounds. There is more collaborative learning. Students can rely more on their peers for suggestions, evaluations and information. The instructor doesn't need to be the sole provider of this. You need to learn to work with people you might not like. This is an advantage because it's important training in learning to work with different personalities. (Respondent # 4)

Responses of graduates regarding the cohort group pointed out similar attributes. "Because the cohort group knew each other so well, we were more willing to share ideas and programs. No one felt inhibited about sharing ideas." "Great to be in a diverse group of students of different ages and with different life experiences." "The maturity level and commitment level of people in the program was very inspiring." "It would be very difficult as an adult learner to be in a class with 18 year olds." When asked to comment on the disadvantages of the cohort model, a majority of the interns and graduates did not indicate any negative aspects.

Choice of an Intensive One Year Program. When comparing the advantages and the disadvantages of undergoing an intensive one-year program, interns acknowledged overwhelmingly that the completion of the teacher certification program in just one calendar year was a major reason for their enrollment in GTC. In addition, they were attracted to the structure of the program that provided application of the GTC course credits to a graduate degree.

They believed that because of the accelerated pace of the program, only mature, capable and serious students would be motivated in being committed to the program. Consequently, the program made a commitment to offer only courses that were essential in preparing pre-service teachers and provide valuable comprehensive theories that would be applicable to effective practice in the year-long field placements in K-12 schools.

It is common for graduates to compare their experiences to those of others. "Student teachers don't get as much of a taste of the real world. We were further ahead when we started teaching on our own, but we still have to learn as we go."

Personal Impact of Being in an Intensive Program. Despite the benefits of being in an accelerated program, many of the respondents described some of the disadvantages of dedicating their lives to this type of program. Many mentioned that they often felt overwhelmed and tired because of the long days spent in field placements followed by six hours of classes. They also described the stress level associated with learning a vast amount of information in a limited time frame. This raised concerns and questions about the quality of their learning. As Respondent 10 pointed out:

Because it's fast and furious, do we miss out on anything is a concern of mine. Hammering away at all these courses is difficult and time consuming. Does the intensity take away from the effectiveness of learning? Maybe some things get neglected in some classes because the workload is greater in others.

Like current interns, graduates provide praise and recommendations regarding the program. "The program offers a great opportunity to switch careers in a short period of time." Graduates remember the "long nights of classes twice a week." Despite their academic skills, they found that "compacting and retaining all of the information is difficult in such a short period of time." Both current interns and graduates want more sharing, more practical information on classroom management and teaching strategies earlier, as well as, more examples of good lesson plans and teaching styles in university classes.

Current interns reported that because of the one-year commitment to the program, they had to make major financial and social sacrifices and changes in their lives. Over 77% of the sampled respondents declared that they either quit their jobs or significantly reduced the number of hours they worked. As a result, their financial status declined, and about half of the respondents stated that they resorted to taking out loans for the year. In addition to the financial burden, over 77% of the respondents also described the detrimental effects to their social relationships. They mentioned that the time commitment needed to meet the standards of the program resulted in little time for gatherings and interactions with family and friends. Some even reported that the neglect of their personal relationships has caused emotional strains that produced the disintegration of marriages and relationships with partners. Respondent # 8 stated succinctly: "Broke up with my girlfriend. Essentially quit my job and put myself into a lot of debt."

Graduates of the program acknowledge both the financial and personal strains of participating in the GTC program, but they put it into the context of

being a teacher with all of the demands placed on them. They imply that the program helps prepare them to deal with the many responsibilities placed on them as teachers.

Full-year Field Placement Experience. Although many of the interns made great sacrifices in order to commit fully to becoming successful teachers in the program, the majority of the interns appreciated the intensive one-year field placements in the schools and noted that the positive aspects far outweighed the negative factors of the program. Many of the respondents explained that being placed in the K-12 setting for an entire school year provided them with a more realistic and in-depth view of the school system. They had the advantage of building valuable rapport with students, teachers and administrators and the opportunity to participate in school events and activities throughout the school year. In short, this year-long placement allowed for the gradual assimilation of the pre-service teachers into the teaching process, which permitted better reflection and awareness of their teaching development.

Graduates of the program speak most highly of the importance of being in the schools for an academic year as noted in the following comments. "Starting at the beginning of the year and staying with a class gives you more of a sense for being a real teacher." "It was terrific to see the development of student learning and the results of the work we had put in to teaching them over an entire year." "We formed strong bonds with the staff and students--we felt like one of the staff." "We developed an understanding of a school culture and a true depth of understanding for the job of being a teacher." "Getting in the classroom so quickly while you learn theory and put it into practice was a true benefit."

GTC interns acknowledged and recognized that one of the major strengths of the intensive yearlong program is the dedication of the instructors and advisors of the program. As one student remarked:

It is an excellent program and I would recommend it to anyone who may ask my opinion. The faculty and support staff are great people. They are very supportive. I find my advisor doing a lot for support and encouragement. (Respondent # 1).

This is echoed in a comment made by a GTC graduate who said, "The staff understood the needs and special situations of an adult learner."

GTC Completers

Interns who successfully complete the GTC program are teachers. Nearly all have assumed teaching positions in schools. One middle school principal has hired three of our GTC graduates. He states, "I'd rather have a GTC graduate, if I can get one, as they are committed, mature, bright and energetic. They bring an understanding of how to relate to our students in a meaningful manner. They make the subjects come alive."

Past GTC interns are teaching in a variety of settings primarily in Michigan (but some have moved to other states), in small communities and urban settings, and in traditional public schools, charter schools and private schools. They report that it was a good decision for them to change careers. Many have already returned to the university to finish the master's degree they started as part of the GTC program. Only two report that they have returned to a former career, or assumed a new one, but still use some of the information they learned.

When asking past interns if they thought that they could have become teachers without the program a typical response is, "I wouldn't have been able to do it with a degree only. Knowing the material isn't good enough. I needed to know how to relate to students, classroom management, and strategies for teaching."

From these comments and our own observations, our choices to have interns progress as a cohort, be placed in one setting for a year and follow a "just in time" theory into practice model continue to be affirmed even though we acknowledge that a single setting may limit a GTC intern's perspective. Faculty continue to find ways to juxtapose assignments across courses to build intern expertise, respond to students' concerns by modeling appropriate teaching styles and pointing them out as they teach, and seek regular feedback on all aspects of the program. Like our students, we are learning as we go.

Lessons We Have Learned

What have we learned about the needs of adults who want to change careers? Adults want to learn how to be successful teachers. They recognize the need to learn about pupils, schools, and teaching. They want to invest their time and money in a well-organized, well-planned program that takes advantage of the limited time they have to learn a new career. They prefer to control their experiences but are willing to become flexible as they work hard to reach their goal of making a difference as a teacher. They hold high standards for themselves and for their instructors and mentors. Thus, they want each portion of the program to be of high quality--good placements, positive role models, clear assignments,

linkages between theory and practice, positive and constructive support, responsive faculty and staff, and committed peers. They understand reality but still strive for the ideal. The interns we serve don't want a shortcut. They do want a quality experience. This is a continuing challenge for us all.

REFERENCES

- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. New York: Author.
- Cruickshank, D. R. (1987). *Reflective teaching: The preparation of students of teaching*. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.
- Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Arlington, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Griffin, G. A. & Wise, A. E. (1992). *Excellence in teacher education: Helping teachers develop learner-centered schools*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think*. Chicago: Henry Regnery.
- Dewey, J (1938). *Education and experience*. NY: Collier.
- Dilworth, M. E. (Ed.). (1992). *Diversity in teacher education: New expectations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gideonse, H. D. (Ed.). (1992). *Teacher education policy: Narratives, stories, and cases*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools*. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

Houston, W. R., Haberman, M. & Sikula, J. (Eds.). (1990). *Handbook of research on Teacher Education*. A project of the Association of Teacher Educators. New York: Macmillan.

Howsam, R. B., Corrigan, D. C., & Denemark, G. W. (1985). *Educating a profession*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Lasley, T. J. (Ed.). (1986). *The dynamics of change in teacher education*. Vol. 1. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education. (1985). *A call for change in teacher education*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2000). *Principles and Standards for School Mathematics*. Reston, VA: Author.

Posner, G. (1993). *Field experience: A guide to reflective teaching*. (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York: Doubleday.

Shulman, J. (Ed.). (1992). *Case methods in teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sparks-Langer, G, & Colton, A. (1991). Synthesis of research on teachers' reflective teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 48(6), 37-44.

Valli, L.(Ed.). (1992). *Reflective teacher education: Cases and critiques*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Zeichner, K., & Liston, D. (1996). *Reflective teaching: An introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

LIST OF ADDITIONAL READINGS

- Brookfield, S. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, D. (1999). Promoting reflective thinking: Preservice teachers' literacy autobiographies as a common text. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 42(5), 402-409.
- Brown, R. G. (1991). *Schools of thought: How the politics of literacy shape thinking in the classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brubacher, J., Case, C. W., & Reagan, T. G. (1994). *Becoming a reflective educator: How to build a culture of inquiry in the schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Cohen, S. & Solmon, L. C. (Eds.). (1989). *From the campus: Perspectives on the school reform movement*. New York: Praeger
- Elliot, J. (1993). *Reconstructing teacher education*. Washington, DC: Falmer.
- Gonzalez, Y. E., & Sjostrom, B.R. (1998). Critical reflection for professional development: A comparative study of nontraditional adult and traditional student teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49(3), 177-186.
- Griffiths, M., & Tann, S. (1992). Using reflective practice to link personal and public theories. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 18(1), 69-84.
- Hole, S & McEntee, G. H (1999). Reflection is at the heart of practice. *Educational Leadership*, 56(8) 34-37.

King, P. K., & Kitchner, K.S. (1994). *Developing reflective judgment: Understanding and promoting intellectual growth and critical thinking skills in adolescents and adults*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Krol, C. A. (1997). Kum'in too turnz: Coming to terms: Reflective practice. *English Journal*, 86(5), 96-97.

LaBoskey, V. K. (1994). *Development of reflective practice: A study of preservice teachers*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Leavitt, H. B. (1992). *Issues and problems in teacher education: An international handbook*. New York: Greenwood.

Levine, H. & Rheingold, H. (1987). *The cognitive connection: Thought and language in man and machine*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Lieberman, A. (Ed.) (1992). *The changing contexts of teaching*. K. J. Rehage (NSSE Ed.) 91st Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, pt. 1. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Liston, D. P. & Zeichner, K. M. (1991). *Teacher education and the social conditions of schooling*. New York: Routledge.

Murray, F. B. (1996). *The teacher educator's handbook: Building a knowledge base for the preparation of teachers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1991). *A political sociology of educational reform: Power/ knowledge in teaching, teacher education, and research*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Pultorak, E.G. (1993). Facilitating reflective thought in novice teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 44, 283-291.

Pultorak, E.G. (1996). Following the developmental process of reflection in novice teachers: Three years of investigation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 47, 283-291.

Reagan, T. (1993). Educating the "reflective practitioner": The contribution of the philosophy of education. *Journal of Research and Development*, 26(4), 189-196.

Rudnick, J., & Hopkins, D. (1985). *Research as the basis for teaching*. London: Heinmann.

Sikula, J. P., Buttery, T. J., & Guyton, E. (Eds.) (1996). *Handbook of research on teacher education*. A project of the Association of Teacher Educators. New York: Macmillan.

Silberman, C. (1971). *Crisis in the classroom*. New York: Random House

Sizer, T. (1992). *Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Swain, S. S. (1998). Studying teacher's transformations: Reflection as methodology. *The Clearing House*, 72(1), 28-34.

Tabachnick, B. R. & Zeichner, K. M. (Eds.). (1991). *Issues and practices in inquiry-oriented teacher education*. New York: Falmer.

Taggart, G. L. & Wilson, A. (1998). *Promoting reflective thinking in teachers: 44 action strategies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Thomas, J. (1998). On becoming a good teacher: Reflective practice with regard to children's voices. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49(5), 372-380.

Tomlinson, P. (1999). Conscious reflection and implicit learning in teacher preparation. Part I: Recent light on an old issue. *Oxford Review of Education*, 25(3), 405-424.



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: <i>TEACHER EDUCATION FOR CAREER CHANGERS</i>	
Author(s): <i>LORETTA KONECKI, DON POTTOFF, CARYN KING, EMILY LIN, DOROTHY ARMSTRONGS, SHERKILL PRYOR, BARBARA REINKEN, SHERY COLLINS, JACQUE MELIN, JANET SNEYER AND GLENDA EIKENBERRY</i>	
Corporate Source: <i>GRAND VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY, GRAND RAPIDS, MI</i>	Publication Date: <i>02/05/02</i>

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY <i>Sample</i> TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY <i>Sample</i> TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
2A

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY <i>Sample</i> TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
2B

Level 1



Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

Level 2A



Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

Level 2B



Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign
here, →
please

Signature: <i>Dr. Emily Lin</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: <i>EMILY LIN/PROFESSOR / DR.</i>	
Organization/Address: <i>GRAND VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY 301 WEST FULTON SUITE 920 GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49504</i>	Telephone: <i>(616) 771-6650</i>	FAX: <i>(616) 771-6515</i>
	E-Mail Address: <i>line@gvsu.edu</i>	Date: <i>02/14/02</i>



(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: <div style="text-align: center;">ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education 1307 New York Ave., NW Suite 300 Washington, DC 20005-4701</div>

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: <http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com>